

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,983	03/07/2001	Bob Ebert	PALM-3524.US.P	5877
7590	08/25/2004		EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Two North Market Street, Third Floor San Jose, CA 95113			ZHOU, TING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/801,983	EBERT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Ting Zhou	2173		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 9 June 2004 under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/801,983 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
2. The amendment submitted with the filing of the RCE on 9 June 2004 have been received and entered. Claims 1-27 as amended are pending in the application.
3. It is noted that in the amendments to the claims received on 9 June 2004, claims 4, 16 and 17 are under the status of "Currently Amended". However, the examiner did not find any markings indicating additions or deletions to the claims. Since no amendments were found for claims 4, 16 and 17, the examiner assumes these claims are presented as originally claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-2, 10-13, 16-19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vong et al. U.S. Patent 6,209,011.

Referring to claims 1 and 18, Vong et al. teach a method and system in an electronic device comprising a processor, memory unit, display screen and a notification system that alerts users of an event (column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this method and system is capable of receiving a first attention request (call) from a first application that is associated with a first record entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager receives this attention request from the alarm manager) (column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing the first attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the request is sent to the notification manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer system) (column 5, lines 8-19), automatically sending a first request for information to the first application when the first record entry requires attention from the user, the information

associated with the first record entry (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the interrupt manager sends this request to the first application, or the notification manager to be executed) (column 7, lines 32-44), creating a notification dialog for displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box displaying alarm information, as shown in Figure 7), and automatically displaying the notification dialog on top of an on-screen display that is generated by a second application that is active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an 8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or displaying a dialog box alarm containing the notification information while other applications are running) (column 5, lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30).

Referring to claim 11, Vong et al. teach a method of notification that alerts users of an event (column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this method is capable of receiving a first attention request from a first application that is associated with a first record entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager receives this attention

request from the alarm manager) (column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing the first attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the request is sent to the notification manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer system) (column 5, lines 8-19), determining a plurality of outstanding attention requests wherein each are associated with a corresponding record entry and a corresponding application, each of the outstanding attention requests still requiring attention from the user, the plurality of outstanding attention requests including the first attention request (ability to determine and handle a plurality of attention requests from multiple applications requiring attention from the user; this can also include the first attention request, which can be snoozed, and therefore, still requiring attention from the user) (column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33), automatically sending a first request for information to the first application, the information being associated with the first record entry and is dependent on the number of outstanding attention requests being managed (a plurality of alarms can be set for 8:00AM and therefore, when the hardware clock determines that it is 8:00AM, the alarm manager can send a plurality of notifications to the notification manager) (column 7, lines 24-31 and column 8, lines 31-39), creating a first notification dialog for displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box displaying alarm

information, as shown in Figure 7), and automatically displaying the first notification dialog on top of an on-screen display associated with a second application that is active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an 8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or displaying a dialog box alarm containing the notification information while other applications are running) (column 5, lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30).

Referring to claims 2 and 19, Vong et al. disclose determining a plurality of outstanding attention requests, each associated with a corresponding record entry and a corresponding application, each of outstanding attention requests still requiring attention from the user, the plurality of outstanding requests including the first attention request (ability to determine and handle a plurality of attention requests from multiple applications requiring attention from the user; this can also include the first attention request, which can be snoozed, and therefore, still requiring attention from the user) (column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33).

Referring to claims 10 and 27, Vong et al. teach a method and system in which the electronic device is a palm sized computer system (portable handheld computing device), as recited in column 1, lines 63-64.

Referring to claim 12, Vong et al. teach receiving a display request (notification request) to display a selected record entry associated with a selected attention request from the plurality of outstanding attention requests (request to display a notification alarm), automatically switching from the second application (user interface allowing users to schedule an event notification) to the third application associated with the selected record entry (notification mechanism responsible for displaying scheduled notifications), displaying the attention request

(turning on the LED or displaying the dialog box) and providing user interface with the selected record entry through the second application, as recited in column 2, lines 24-26 and 52-58, and column 5, lines 8-18 and 37-42.

Referring to claim 13, Vong et al. teach automatically launching the third application (the notification application is automatically activated upon the occurrence of an event) and automatically sending the display request to the third application (after the user schedules an event, the calendar application automatically calls the notification application with the request), as recited in column 3, lines 60-65 and column 7, lines 14-30.

Referring to claim 16, Vong et al. teach receiving a request to suspend the plurality of outstanding attention requests, suspending each of the plurality of outstanding attention requests for a predetermined period of time (rescheduling the alarm for an additional five-minute period), reactivating the second application and displaying the plurality of outstanding attention requests after a predetermined period of time has elapsed in the second notification dialog (redisplaying the alarm after the five-minute snooze time has elapsed), as recited in column 8, lines 20-30 and further illustrated in Figure 7.

Referring to claim 17, Vong et al. teach invoking (displaying) an alarm simultaneously with the display of the dialog box and the alarm taken from a group consisting essentially of an audible alarm (audio device), a visual alarm (light), a vibrator (vibration device), a flashing LED and flashing the notification dialog, as recited in column 4, lines 4-15 and column 8, lines 16-30). This is further shown in the table given in column 6, lines 45-57.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-9, 14-15 and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vong et al. U.S. Patent 6,209,011 as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Chari et al. U.S. Patent 6,553,416.

Referring to claims 3 and 20, Vong et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. They also teach the deactivation of requests when the user acknowledges the notification alert (column, lines 62-65). However, they do not teach the deletion of the deactivated request from memory. Chari et al. teach a method and system for managing alerts similar to that of Vong et al. In addition, Chari et al. further teach the deletion of notifications in column 12, lines 10-28. This can also be seen in Figure 4A (reference character “438”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having teachings of Vong et al. and Chari et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the notification system and method of Vong et al. to include the ability to delete notifications, as taught by Chari et al. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to conserve memory space by deleting requests that are no longer active and in need of attention.

Referring to claims 4-5 and 21-22, while Vong et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, they fail to teach the ability to request and view information regarding the attention requests in a list format. As can be seen from Figure 6, Chari et al. show the display of a log window containing the list of alerts that are still active. Therefore, if there are active

attention requests, they can be determined and displayed on a display screen via a notification dialog that contains a list of these alerts, as recited in column 7, lines 37-46. Having the teachings of Vong et al. and Chari et al. before him at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification system and method of Vong et al. to include the list format display of active notifications, as taught by Chari et al. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow the users to view and keep track of all active notification alerts together in a log file.

Referring to claims 6-9 and 23-26, while Vong et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, they fail to teach the ability to request and view the attention request information in detailed format and the singular display of the details of the attention requests. As can be seen in Figure 5, Chari et al. show the display of one detailed notification dialog (alert screen) that contains all the details regarding the alert, i.e., the date, time, and description of the alert. Therefore, this shows detailed information regarding a notification can be gathered and singularly displayed on the screen as a detailed notification dialog. It would then have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the detailed format of display for the alerts can be requested whether the plurality of attention requests contain every request except the first attention request, as is the case in claims 6, 7, 23 and 24, or only the first attention request, as is the case in claims 8, 9, 25 and 26. Having the teachings of Vong et al. and Chari et al. before him at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification system and method of Vong et al. to include the singular display of detailed notification dialogs, as taught by Chari et al. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow users to view all the details related to an alert in a single window display.

Referring to claims 14 and 15, Vong et al. disclose all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. Specifically, Vong et al. teach clearing (turning off) the outstanding attention requests (notification alarms) once the user acknowledges he is aware of the notifications (via pressing the snooze button for example), as recited in column 8, lines 16-30. However, Vong et al. fail to disclose the steps of receiving a request to clear one or all outstanding attention requests, and clearing the selected attention request by deleting it from memory. Chari et al. teach a method for managing alerts similar to that of Vong et al. In addition, they further teach, in column 12, lines 9-28, receiving a request from the user to clear an attention request (delete an alert) and deleting that alert from memory. Specifically, they describe the ability to delete a plurality of alerts (column 12, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Vong et al. and Chari et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the notification system capable of clearing outstanding attention requests of Vong et al. to include the ability to delete alerts, as taught by Chari et al. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to conserve memory space by deleting one or a plurality of alerts from the system.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 9 June 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. With regard to independent claims 1 and 18, applicant particularly points out that embodiments of the invention, as claimed in claims 1 and 18, disclose an attention request associated with a record entry that is sent to an attention manager at the time of the event, e.g.,

when the record entry requires attention. As a result, the attention request is received and stored at the time when the record entry requires attention, and not before the event is scheduled to occur, as in the Vong et al. reference. Applicant further asserts that the Vong et al. reference is directed to a notification system that stores, schedules and manages the notifications prior to their specified time for action, as opposed to when the event occurs. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the examiner agrees that various applications in the Vong et al. reference, such as the calendar application, schedules notifications for the notification manager to handle prior to the time of occurrence of the events, the notification manager does not actually receive, store and display the notifications until the notifications occur. For example, if the calendar application schedules a notification with certain notification options such as flashing an LED or displaying a dialog box for an 8:00AM alarm, the notification manager calls the alarm manager to set the hardware alarm for 8:00AM. When the hardware alarm reaches 8:00AM, in other words, when this notification request actually requires attention, the alarm manager sends an interrupt to the notification manager informing the notification manager that the calendar application wants to display a notification (column 7, lines 24-45). Therefore, the alarm manager does not send, and correspondingly, the notification manager does not receive this attention request for the alarm notification, or record entry, until the event occurs. Furthermore, when the notification manager receives an interrupt from the alarm manager that a notification requires attention, such as when the hardware alarm indicates that it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm set by the calendar applications needs to be displayed, the notification manager determines the alarm information, such as how the notification is to be carried out. Since the notification manager taught by the Vong et al. reference resides in the memory of the device (column 5, lines

8-18), consequently this information is also stored in memory when the alarm manger interrupts the notification manager when the notification request requires attention.

In addition, the applicant further asserts that in the Vong et al. reference, the dialog text displayed within the notification is created before the specified time of the notification. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Similar to the explanation above, although the calendar application schedules the notification and can choose methods of displaying the notification, the notification does not create the alarm, by displaying a dialog box for example, until the alarm manager sends an interrupt to the notification manager when the notification occurs (column 7, lines 32-44 and column 8, lines 16-30). For example, upon receiving the interrupt from the alarm manager when the hardware alarm indicates that it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm set by the calendar applications needs to be displayed, the notification manager checks how the user wants the notification to be displayed and it is then, when the notification requires attention, that the notification manager creates the dialog on the display, as recited in column 8, lines 16-30 and further shown in Figure 7. Therefore, the Vong et al. reference teach the notification manager receives, stores and creates the notification on the display at the specified time of the notification.

8. Furthermore, with regard to independent claim 11, the applicant particularly points out that analogous to claims 1 and 18, claim 11 further describes the requesting, creating and filling in of information when the record entry requires attention. With respect to the arguments regarding these aspects of claim 11 analogous to that of claims 1 and 18, examiner maintains similar responses as that recited above. In addition, the applicant asserts that the Vong et al. reference does not teach the notification dialog is dependent on the number of outstanding

attention requests being managed, as recited in the limitation “automatically sending a first request for information to the first application, said information being associated with said first record entry and is dependent on the number of outstanding attention requests being managed”, on lines 16-19 of claim 11 of the applicant’s invention. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The notification manager can handle an arbitrary number of notification and a displayed notification can represent multiple notifications (column 8, lines 31-35); so, there can be multiple notifications set for 8:00AM and when the hardware alarm indicates that it is 8:00AM, the notification manager can receive and display multiple notifications set for that time (column 8, lines 31-39). Therefore, the notifications sent to the notification manager from the alarm manager depends on the number of alarms set for that time; if there are one notification set for that time, the notification manager receives information for one alarm, if there are two notifications set for that time, the notification manager receives information for two alarms, etc.

9. In view of these responses to the applicant’s arguments and the rejections set forth in this office action, the examiner believes that the Vong et al. reference anticipates the presently claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (703) 305-0328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

4 August 2004